

Application Number: 10/782,174
Office Action Dated: April 23, 2010
Response Dated: August 19, 2010

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claim 23 to recite that the cradle includes a first pair of the rods forming a first base structure from which the rods thereof further extend, and a second pair of the rods forming a second base structure from which the rods thereof further extend.

Claims 24 to 27 have been amended to ensure a proper antecedent basis.

Claims 28 to 30 remain as presented on March 15, 2010.

Claim 31 has been cancelled without prejudice and Applicant reserves the right to re-file claim 31 as well as claims 23 to 27 as presented on March 15, 2010 as part of continuation application.

No new subject matter has been added to the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103 (a)

Examiner has rejected claims 23 to 31 under 35 USC § 103 (a) on the basis that these claims are allegedly obvious having regard to United States Patent Number 5,647,521 to Burgess (hereinafter "Burgess") in view of United States Patent Application Number 5,067,641 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter "Johnson et al.").

Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's allegation that claims 23 to 31 are obvious having regard to Burgess in view of Johnson et al. However, in the interest of expediting the allowance of this application, Applicant has amended the claims to define the tines as rods and limit the functional use of the rods to receiving a crown fork of a bicycle.

Application Number: 10/782,174
Office Action Dated: April 23, 2010
Response Dated: August 19, 2010

Neither Burgess nor Johnson et al. disclose or suggest a cradle with four rods much less a cradle configured to receive a crown fork of a bicycle. Burgess discloses a pair of resting plates configured to receive a top tube (also known as a cross bar) of a bicycle. See column 5, line 49 to 64, and Figure 5 of Burgess. Johnson et al. disclose a pair of hangar brackets configured to receive a rear fork and top tube of a bicycle. See column 3, lines 51 to 58, and Figure 2 of Johnson et al.

In view of the above it is requested that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 USC § 103 (a) as the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest Applicant's invention as presently claimed.

Conclusion

In light of the above-mentioned amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in order for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adrian Jorgenson/

Adrian Jorgenson
Reg. No. 62,911
Suite 1401 - 1166 Alberni Street
Vancouver, BC
Canada V6E 3Z3
Tel: (604) 688-6442
Fax: (604) 688-6445

Application Number: 10/782,174
Office Action Dated: April 23, 2010
Response Dated: August 19, 2010

Certification of Electronic Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being electronically transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown on the first page of this document.

/Adrian Jorgenson/
Adrian Jorgenson

August 19, 2010
Date

AJ9118.1786